DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 120 EA 012 027

AUTHOR Johnson, James R.
TITLE Change Episode: Evaluation of Non-Classroom Assigned Certificated Personnel.
PUB DATE 14 Jul 78
NOTE 45p.; Prepared in conjunction with the University of La Verne (California) Doctoral Program in School Management; Appendices C through F may be illegible

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Personnel Evaluation; *Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Corona Unified School District CA

ABSTRACT

This study included a review of the literature to determine if tools exist for the evaluation of nonclassroom assigned certificated school personnel. All unified school districts in California with ADA between ten and twelve thousand were polled to ascertain their practices for similar situations. A problem-solving team was established to review the material that was contributed. The result of this study was the creation of a form, approved by the district administration, for the evaluation of nonclassroom assigned certificated personnel. A sample of the form is included in the appendix of the study. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175120

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE
DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

CHANGE EPISODE:

EVALUATION OF NON-CLASSROOM ASSIGNED CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL

Author

James R. Johnson

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Johnson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 012 027

PREFACE

This document was prepared in conjunction with the University of La Verne Doctoral Program in School Management. It is representative of a program requirement that each candidate complete the equivalent of ten Change Episodes. A Change Episode is the identification of a management problem within the job setting, its submission to systematic problem-solving, and the evaluation of outcomes.

Change Episodes do not require the rigorous design and analysis associated with formal research. They may be termed as action research which deals with a specific setting and a specific set of circumstances. Consequently, application beyond that setting should be approached with caution.

Inquiries regarding this study should be addressed directly to the author. Inquiries regarding the Doctoral Program in School Management should be directed to:

Department of School Management
University of La Verne
1950 Third Street
La Verne, California 91750

ABSTRACT

The recent growth of specially-funded state and federal programs has caused school administrators' time and effectiveness to be stretched beyond desirability. In an effort to compensate for the increased demands, school districts are, by increasing numbers, appointing certificated personnel to non-classroom assignments. These positions are generally not considered administrative and therefore the personnel are not evaluated as administrators.

In the State of California, teachers are evaluated by the terms of the Stull Bill which stipulates that teacher effectiveness is measured in terms of student performance. This situation creates a difficult situation as personnel employed in these newer positions are left with no effective means of evaluation.

This study included a review of the literature to determine if tools exist for the evaluation of non-classroom assigned certificated school personnel. All unified school districts in California with ADA between ten and twelve thousand were polled to ascertain their practices for similar situations. A problem solving team was established to review the material which was contributed.

The result of this study was the creation of a form, approved by the district administration for the evaluation of non-classroom assigned certificated personnel. A sample of the form is included in the appendix of the study.

UNIVERSITY OF LA VERNE

DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

Change Episode Four

EVALUATION OF NON-CLASSROOM ASSIGNED CERTIFICATED PERSONNEL

James R. Johnson

July 14, 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Historical Setting	1
	Need for the Study	2
	Population Under Study	3
	Definition of Terms	4
II.	THE PROBLEM	7
	The Problem Solving Team	7
	Definition of the Problem	8
	Solution Criteria	10
III.	SURVEY OF SOLUTION ALTERNATIVES	12
	Review of the Literature	12
	Survey of Practices	20
IV.	PROBLEM SOLUTIONS	22
	Solution Alternatives Selected	22
	Criteria for Selection of Components	22
	Approval of Final Form	23
	Field Test Plans	23
	Field Test Plans Review Process	24
V.	RESULTS	25
VI.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	27
	Conclusions	27
	Recommendations	27
APPENDIX		28
	A. Letter Mailed to Selected Directors of Personnel	28
	B. Letter Sent to Certificated Management Team Members	29
	C. Proposed Form	30
	D. Sections 2, 5, 6, and 7 of Final Form	31
	E. Sections 3 and 6 of Final Form	32
	F. Final Form	33
	G. Approval Memo from Superintendent	34
	H. Cover Letter to Responding Contributors	35

BIBLIOGRAPHY 36

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure Page

1. Summary of the Problem Under Investigation 9

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Historical Setting

The vision of one-room schools is called to mind when one thinks of early school systems. Many a light-hearted comment has been made regarding the role of the "school marm." In addition to teaching, she was custodian, bookkeeper, superintendent, and performed all duties necessary to keep the little one-room schoolhouse operating. As towns grew and populations increased, additional rooms were built on the same sites and eventually multi-room schools became the rule rather than the exception.

Schools eventually began to hire personnel to handle the non-teaching duties and thus teachers could devote full time to classroom instruction. Schools continued to grow and personnel were continually added. It became evident that someone was needed to complete administrative details if the teacher's full time was to be spent on teaching duties. Teachers began selecting a fellow teacher at their site to be a "principal teacher." Their role was merely to relieve the teachers of administrative duties and allow them, once again, to devote full time to instruction.

Through the years the role of the "principal teacher" has evolved as the administrative leader in the school. However, demands continue to increase on both administrators and teachers and the desire for additional personnel and assistance increased for both parties.

The recent growth in specially-funded state and federal programs,

coupled with the increased emphasis on individualized instruction, has caused school administrators' time and effectiveness to be spread beyond the point of desirability. To compensate for the increased demands of the position, districts are, by increasing numbers, appointing certificated personnel to non-classroom assignments. The staff assigned to these positions, while required to hold a teaching credential, are not assigned students on a regular basis. Many hold quasi-administrative positions, yet do not enjoy the full range of benefits available to the management team.

Need for the Study

As in any position, employees need to be evaluated. California State law is specific as to the type of evaluation that shall be performed when evaluating classroom teachers. The Stull Bill, enacted in 1971, stipulates that teacher effectiveness will be evaluated in terms of performance objectives established for their students.

Individual districts have developed individual procedures for the evaluation of their administrative personnel. Left in limbo is this new class of certificated personnel. They have no regularly-assigned class, so cannot be evaluated according to the progress of their students. They are not members of the management team and therefore are generally not included in that procedure.

Persons holding such positions find themselves in a unique position when it comes to performance evaluation. Unless their employer has adopted a special form, they must be evaluated on either of the following:

1. A classroom teacher evaluation form - An instrument designed in response to the Stull Bill, specifically for the evaluation of personnel who have students assigned to them on a regular basis.

2. An administrative evaluation form. - A tool or procedure adopted by individual districts exclusively for the evaluation of members of the management team.

Equally concerned is the evaluator, who must determine which tool is most appropriate, or design one to fit his/her unique setting. Since neither form fits this unique situation, these people have no specific form or procedure and are therefore either evaluated on an informal impromptu version of an existing form, or not evaluated at all. The end result in either situation is an uncoordinated evaluation schedule giving the impression of a lack of concern for individual performance.

As the number of these positions increases, likewise the need for a uniform procedure or tool becomes apparent. Just as individual districts have a common procedure for the evaluation of all classroom personnel and management team members, an evaluation procedure for the non-classroom assigned certificated personnel should be uniform.

Population Under Study

The purpose of this study was to develop a tool or procedure to evaluate the effectiveness of non-classroom assigned certificated personnel employed by the Corona-Norco Unified School District. The Corona-Norco Unified School District, the second largest public school district in Riverside County, is located in Southern California fifty miles east of Los Angeles. It comprises 160 square miles, including the incorporated cities of Corona and Norco and five unincorporated areas where the 19,000 students residing in the district attend twenty-five schools (Kindergarten through grade 12) governed by the local board of education. This study involves the seventy-five non-classroom assigned certificated personnel who are a part of the district's

1500 employees, of whom 850 are certificated and 650 are classified.

In an effort to arrive at measurable means of comparison, it was decided to survey all districts in California of a size and composition comparable to the Corona-Norco Unified School District. Therefore, all unified districts in California with ADA between ten and twenty thousand were polled for input. In addition, each of the administrators in the district was asked to submit a copy of the instruments used to evaluate non-classroom assigned certificated personnel. However, as the study progressed, a few other districts, some of which are outside of California, were identified as having an outstanding procedure in use and they were contacted for input. If an evaluative tool could be developed as a result of this study, it is planned to use the developed tool in a field test phase during the 1978-79 school year and review its effectiveness at the close of that school year.

Definition of Terms

1. Administrator - A certificated employee of a public school district who holds a position requiring the supervision and evaluation of other employees.
2. Assessment - The act of gathering data to determine the degree of achievement of objectives.
3. Average Daily Attendance (A.D.A.) - The average of the year's student attendance for a given school year. A common figure used to compare the size of school districts.
4. Certificated employee - An employee of a public school district holding a position requiring a teaching credential earned as a result of collegiate study.

5. Classified employee - An employee of a public school district holding a position not requiring any advanced training or credentialing, i.e. secretary, bus driver, custodian, etc.
6. Classroom Teacher - A certificated employee of a public school district who is assigned to a specific classroom and is responsible for the total educational environment for the specific grade and/or subject.
7. District - A legally formed governmental organization responsible for the education of all school-aged children residing within its boundaries.
8. Evaluation - The process which seeks to assess the worth of a program, procedure, objective, or in judging the potential utility of alternative approaches.
9. Goals - Broad generalized statements of what is hoped to be accomplished. Can be stated as long and short term. Short term are generally those one year or less in length.
10. Management Team - A collective group of certificated and classified employees of a public school district, who, as part of their position, are responsible for the supervision and evaluation of other employees.
11. Objectives - Written statements of the goals which both parties in the evaluation process agree should be accomplished during a specified time period. They must be measurable, time-phased, explicit, realistic, and related to the goal.
12. Stull Bill - A legislative measure enacted in 1971 in the State of California. The bill requires a set of classroom goals and objectives written at the beginning of each school year by the individual teacher. The effectiveness of the teacher is then measured at the end of the school year by the students' progress toward the attainment of those goals and

objectives.

13. Unified School District - A legal governmental body responsible for the education of children residing within its boundaries and eligible for a free public education ranging from kindergarten to twelfth grade.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM

The components of the problem were classified into the following categories:

Directly involved in the problem:

1. non-classroom assigned certificated personnel,
2. supervisors of non-classroom assigned certificated personnel.
3. Assistant Superintendent, Personnel.

Indirectly involved in the problem:

1. classroom assigned certificated personnel,
2. classified personnel
   a. classroom
   b. non-classroom
3. Superintendent's cabinet,
4. Superintendent,
5. Board of Education.

The Problem Solving Team

To help assure that representation from all areas affected by the components of the problem were represented, a Problem Solving Team was composed, consisting of the following people.

1. The Coordinator of Specialized Instruction for the Corona-Norco Unified School District (the author of this study).
2. Two non-classroom assigned certificated employees.

3. The Assistant Superintendent of Personnel Services,
4. The Coordinator of Individual Student Services, serving as a representative from the management team, and also responsible for the evaluation of non-classroom assigned certificated personnel.
5. The Assistant Superintendent of Instruction.

Every effort was made to include representation from all of the components on the Problem Solving Team. However, in creating a team that would be of manageable size, representation was obtained from each area in the category designated as directly involved and input was obtained from those listed as indirectly involved. The team was deeply involved throughout the entire study and played an active role in the development of the final product.

Definition of the Problem

The problem statement as agreed upon by the Problem Solving Team and therefore the problem undertaken for this study was: How can non-classroom assigned certificated personnel be evaluated validly?

The Problem Solving Team met on numerous occasions to discuss, plan, and evaluate the progress of the study. They worked together to validate the nature of the problem, noting the discrepancies between the desired and existing conditions as listed in Figure 1. The team then established the goal of the study and began soliciting sample evaluative tools from administrators within the Corona-Norco Unified School District and from California districts of comparable size and composition.

Based upon this information, the goal for this study was: To develop a tool to evaluate non-classroom assigned certificated personnel. The developed tool must be meaningful and appropriate for all categories of non-classroom

FIGURE 1

Summary of The
Problem Under Investigation

Existing Conditions	Desired Conditions
1. There is no established form or procedure designed for the evaluation of non-classroom assigned certificated personnel.	1. A form or procedure designed specifically for evaluating non-classroom assigned certificated personnel broad enough to serve all classifications and meaningful in each individual situation.
2. Non-classroom assigned certificated personnel are not receiving feedback—neither positive nor constructive.	2. A method of evaluation which allows for feedback from evaluatee permitting positive and constructive comments.
3. The policy regarding frequency of evaluation is not followed.	3. Evaluator and evaluatee to be fully aware of district policy regarding frequency of evaluation.
4. Completion and submission of evaluations are not monitored.	4. The frequency of evaluations is monitored and evaluators informed of delinquencies.
5. Job descriptions have not been revised and therefore do not currently correspond to existing duties and responsibilities.	5. Provision for periodical review and updating of job description.

assigned certificated personnel in the Corona-Norco Unified School District.

Solution Criteria

With the conditions and goals of the study established by the Problem Solving Team, they then selected the following solution criteria and constraints:

Criteria. The solution should:

1. Be non-ambiguous, simple, and germane;
2. Provide input from evaluator and evaluatee;
3. Be approved by the district's administrative cabinet.

Constraints. The solution must:

1. Be within the confines of the California Administrative Code, Title 5, California Education Code, and district policies;
2. Be acceptable to the Problem Solving Team;
3. Be structured to provide continuity over a period of years;
4. Be manageable, succinct, and easy to administer.

CHAPTER III

SURVEY OF SOLUTION ALTERNATIVES

Review of the Literature

In an effort to gain insight into procedures and/or tools that have already been established for the evaluation of school employees, a search through the literature of the San Mateo Educational Resources Center (SMERC) was conducted. It was felt this would be the most expedient procedure since it would include a search of material and literature from the Educational Information Center (ERIC), the cumulative index of Journals in Education (CIJE) and, through educational materials yet to be published via Fugitive Information Data Organizer (FIDO).

The printout received from SMERC included references to 66 sources dealing in topics relating to:

1. Consultants
2. Evaluation
3. Evaluation Criteria
4. Evaluation Methods
5. Itinerant Teachers
6. Resource Teacher(s)

Of these sources, fourteen were selected as probable sources of specific information. Finding that most sources dealt with the evaluation of programs, rather than personnel, a second search was conducted, emphasizing evaluation of personnel, both teaching and administrative. This search listed eight

references which, when consulted were more appropriate to the subject than the first search.

The general philosophy of the literature which was received indicated that evaluation is a process designed to improve performance which has as an end result an improved learning process. Learning, as defined by the Grossmont Union High School District[1] is defined as a change in behavior. Therefore, if an evaluation system is to be effective, it must be a process where individuals are guided in systematic professional growth and should be an integral part of staff development. To assist in this change, the evaluation must also be cooperatively conceived, designed, and carried out, or the time spent will be of little value.

In a publication dated July, 1973, the Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp. states that the

> . . . primary purpose of an appraisal system is to help teachers strengthen and improve their level of performance and effectiveness. To help achieve the desired goal, the performance-based appraisal system must be a continuous effort based on the shared responsibility of the appraiser and the appraisee in a setting of mutual understanding, respect, and trust.[2]

The most important result in this process is that the concerned parties will have to pool their thoughts on the objectives of their jobs. Although this can be a difficult process, it should assist in an examination of individual performance resulting in a better educational environment for

---

[1]Oldham, Neild. "Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth. Current Trends in School Policies & Programs. An Education U. S. A. Report." National School Public Relations Association, Arlington, Va. 1974, 64 pp.

[2]"Performance-Based Teacher Appraisal Program for the Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation." Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp., Mishawaka, Ind. July, 1973. 62 pp.

the student. Schmidt, in his book "Organizational Frontiers and Human Values," succinctly states the desired situation as follows:

> For there is a time to confront, but also a time to reduce tension:
> A time to use power, but also a time to use persuasion.
> A time to act, but also a time to diagnose.
> A time to accelerate change, but also a time to slow it down.
> A time to intervene, but also a time to refrain from intervening.
> But whether we confront or collaborate, intervene, or analyze, let it flow from understanding and courage and love, and not from ignorance and cowardice and fear — for these cannot long survive on any frontier.[1]

Since an effective evaluation procedure ought to have the purpose of placing the right person in the right job, it must have provisions for assisting the evaluatee to move to other positions in which their chances of success are greater. Therefore, one must be alert to what the procedure does to the person in the process. The Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals[2] stresses the importance of including the basic philosophy, goals, and objectives of the school system in the design of an appraisal system.

In a study conducted by the Arizona State University, College of Education in Tempe, Arizona, it was cited that currently;

> In many instances, the criteria for evaluation are vague, nebulous, undefined and by chance. Evaluations are, therefore, based upon inadequate facts, little or no sampling of specific behavior, upon sentiment, bias, and uncorroborated evidence. Far less attention has been given to this topic than is warranted.[3]

Therefore the task of making valid judgments about educators is extremely complex and the need to do so is urgent.

---

[1]Schmidt, W., "Organizational Frontiers and Human Values." Wadsworth Publishing Co. 1970. p.4.

[2]"Evaluation of Administrators: Guidelines and Procedures." Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals. Westerville. 1971. 35 pp.

[3]"Administration Evaluation." Prepared for Arizona Educators through Arizona Educational Information System, Bureau of Educational Research and Services, College of Education, Arizona State University, Tempe, Ariz. Feb.1975.

While the evaluation varies as the focal point of the evaluation varies, the definition of what is a good effective evaluation, the National Public Relations Association believes, has a far-reaching influence on the lives and work of teachers and pupils.

> In today's changing patterns of evaluation, the trend is away from the negative (identifying poor teachers so they can be dismissed) and toward the positive (identifying weaknesses and strengths so that the former can be corrected and the latter reinforced).
>
> Most educators welcome the thrust toward a positively oriented evaluation procedure. Practicing administrators, however, cannot blink away the fact that there still must be some procedure for identifying and eliminating incompetent teachers who persist in remaining incompetent. Consequently, today many districts attempt to design teacher evaluation procedures that accentuate the positive while retaining aspects of the negative.
>
> . . .any written evaluation that ultimately is put in the teacher's personnel folder, provides potential evidence in a dismissal move. Many districts candidly recognize this, and describe in detail the procedures to be followed in their evaluation policies or guidelines.[1]

Many guidelines were found for the appraisal of evaluative systems, and the points mentioned in several sources are combined here as suggestions for incorporation into an effective system:

1. It should include the basic goals and objectives of the individual school system.
2. It must be built on the fundamental belief that each individual possesses unique and differentiated skills and abilities.
3. It should include a method to involve any person who can make valid judgment. However, at no time should an individual be evaluated by

---

[1]Oldham, Neild. "Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth, Current Trends in School Policies & Progress. An Education U.S.A. Special Report." National School Public Relations Association. Arlington, Va. 1974. p. 8

someone without that individual's knowledge.

4. It should include specific objectives with notation on how best to follow through, being diagnostic and not judgmental, fostering self-evaluation.
5. It should encourage experimentation, creativity, and variation.

While the literature did not show a consensus as to how frequently evaluations should be given, it did emphasize that it should be conducted by the immediate supervisor. An analysis of techniques indicates that the process for the evaluation should include a series of conferences involving input from both parties. The evaluation should stress the establishment of confidentiality and rapport during these conferences and be aimed at trying to get the evaluatee to succeed. The Connecticut State Department of Education, in its Handbook for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers and School Principals,[1] emphasizes the importance of evaluative instruments following the designated job descriptions. This enables the evaluatee to perceive how he is handling the assigned responsibilities and gives constructive suggestions for improvement. A key factor in writing all evaluations and giving all concerned parties a copy was emphasized in each article consulted.

As many sources emphasized a multi-conference approach to effective evaluation, they all stressed the importance of pre-planning for the conference. This pre-planning should include making tentative goals, key factors,

---

[1]Saif, Philip S. "A Handbook for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers and School Principals. Capitol Region Education Council, Bloomfield, Conn. Connecticut State Dept. of Education, Hartford. September 1976. 180 pp.

objectives and plans to accomplish them.

The optimum number of conferences was generally indicated as three and defined as follows:

1. Initial (or pre-) conference held during the early part of the year to agree in writing upon the objectives, activities and methods of evaluation.
2. Mid-year conference designed to offer a preliminary estimate of the degree of achievement. At this time objectives should be added, deleted, modified, or kept. However, the mutual agreement of both parties was stressed.
3. End-of-year (or post) conference to assess the final degree of success. In situations of continuing employment, this could serve as the initial conference as outlined in "1" above.

Each conference should involve active participation with decisions arrived at together. Of prime importance is:

1. The mutual agreement of the activities that will be used to measure outcomes.
2. The definition of applicable standards to be accomplished and spelled out as completely as possible.
3. Establishing priorities as to importance and significance of objectives.

Tuttle anc Ciccone emphasize that the basic consideration for an adequate evaluation includes:

1. An opportunity for individualized and non-inhibitive response.
2. A reflection of past (planning), present (staging), and future (follow-up).
3. Brevity and objectivity.
4. An integral position in the "staging" (assessing) phase

(generally at or near the end).[1]

They further stressed that evaluation should include an opportunity for some individual expression without inhibition. The philosophy stated by the Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals again stressed teamwork when it stressed that:

> The procedure should be a cooperative, supportive, constructive, and personalized appraisal. It should establish a comprehensive, objective, interpersonal relationship based upon clearly-defined and attainable professional goals. The system, when established, should accomplish two objectives: 1) the individual improvement and self-appraisal; 2) evaluation as he fulfills the position to which he is assigned.[2]

Many sources stressed the objectiveness and brevity of evaluators, indicating that lengthy, essay-type evaluations are tiring to both parties and are extremely difficult to score or combine for specific information.

The literature revealed generally three prevalent procedures for the evaluation of personnel. Those three are:

1. Check list - Primarily a supervisory tool, evaluatees generally express strong feelings regarding them as they feel they are not graded as highly as they should be. In isolated cases, in an effort to reduce this problem, some districts have changed to only two symbols denoting acceptable and unacceptable. However, generally the check list is being supplemented by a narrative type evaluation.
2. Conference - A discussion of the evaluation followed by written comments.

---

[1]Tuttle, Lester E., Jr., Ed; Ciccone, Russel A., Ed. "A Guide to Staff Development Activities, Using a Florida Conference as a Model." Florida Atlanta Univ. Boca Raton. Office of Education (HEW). Washington, D.C. June 1969 p.95.

[2]"Evaluation of Administrators: Guidelines and Procedures." Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals. Westerville. 1971. p. 5

While some evaluators indicate reluctance to evaluate people in their presence, others object to writing comments backing up their ratings; a practice usually required of the evaluator to substantiate unsatisfactory or superior ratings.

3. Objective based - A completely non-comparative, individualized process in which the evaluatee works to improve himself through realistic goals set by himself and approved by the evaluator.

Although most are satisfied with the latter procedure, some problems have been encountered. Generally, they revolve around the writing of objectives that are sure to be obtained -- a situation that evolves from supervisors who have little time to evaluate or modify the objectives before they are approved according to Oldham.[1] While most districts seem to limit the number of objectives that should be worked on, Saif feels that:

> There is no sacred number of objectives to be adopted; nor is there a given length of time for each objective. An objective could be successfully accomplished within weeks, while another may last for a year or even longer.[2]

While initially both parties felt that the writing and approving of objectives was a burden placed upon them at the time of assessment, there is generally a feeling of agreement that the time involved was beneficial in the improvement of instruction as was the encompassing philosophy for the entire process of evaluation.

---

[1]Oldham, Neild, "Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth. Current Trends in School Policies & Programs. An Education U.S.A. Special Report." p. 15

[2]Saif, Philip S. "A Handbook for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers and School Principals." p. 6.

Survey of Practices

As mentioned in Chapter I, all unified school districts in California, with an ADA between ten and twelve thousand, were sent a letter explaining the problem under investigation and asked to contribute a copy of the form currently in use in their districts for the evaluation of non-classroom assigned certificated personnel. The letter requesting their response (Appendix A) was mailed to thirty-five districts. Fourteen districts, or 40%, responded and of the fourteen responding districts, four indicated that they would be interested in receiving the results of the final study.

In the returns was an indication that material should be obtained from two other districts not included in the original survey; one in Oregon, and the other in the San Francisco area. Those two districts were contacted and the material was received, making a total of sixteen responses from outside the Corona-Norco Unified School District.

Members of the Management Team of the Corona-Norco Unified School District who are responsible for the evaluation of non-classroom assigned certificated personnel were sent a similar letter (Appendix B), outlining the problem under investigation, and asking that they return a copy of the form which is currently being used by them to evaluate the people in that category under their immediate supervision. These letters were sent out to thirty-eight administrators, and responses were received from eight, or 21%. Only one of the administrators indicated an interest in receiving a copy of the final result.

The twenty-four responses were presented at the second meeting of the Problem Solving Team. The team concluded that there were many good prospects in these samples received. However, they noted the samples

received ranged from simple uninspiring check lists to rather elaborate objective-based multi-paged forms. The Problem Solving Team felt that to further analyze the effectiveness of each of the tools and to possibly select the better part of each of the instruments, they should be divided into categories representing the type of form. This task was completed by the chairman of the Problem Solving Team (the author of this study), and, at the third meeting of the Problem Solving Team, the instruments were presented in four categories ranging from subjective to objective.

CHAPTER IV

PROBLEM SOLUTIONS

Solution Alternatives Selected

The Problem Solving Team selected portions of seven of the samples as high priority for inclusion in a form, as well as specifying additional items they felt should be included. With this direction, the chairman proceeded to develop a rough copy of a proposed form (Appendix C). Included on the form, at the request of the Problem Solving Team, was to be the procedure and time table for its utilization.

Criteria for Selection of Components

The Problem Solving Team had outlined its criteria for the selection of each section of the rough copy as follows:

Criteria 1: - The solution should be non-ambiguous, simple and germane.

The entire form was condensed to one page to meet this criteria.

Criteria 2: - The solution should provide input from evaluator and evaluatee.

Sections 2, 5, 6, and 7 (Appendix D) of the form meets this criteria.

Constraint 3 - The solution must be structured to provide continuity over a period of years.

Sections 3 and 6 (Appendix E) of the form meets this constraint.

Constraint 4 - The solution must be manageable, succinct, and easy to administer.

Sections 2, 5, 6, and 7 (Appendix D) of the form meet this constraint.

At the fourth meeting of the Problem Solving Team, the rough copy of the proposed form was reviewed to determine if it met all of the criteria. The information stated above was confirmed and can be verified by Appendices

D and E. Concern was expressed for the required three evaluation sessions and, while it was determined that a mid-year conference was desirable, it may not always be possible to schedule. Therefore, the form was revised to remove any reference to a mid-year conference, realizing that it was always possible to have a mid-year conference, but it would not be required. The only other changes recommended in the form were in semantics and were made to claify certain areas. A comparison of Appendices C and F will reveal the changes that occured.

Approval of Final Form

Encompassing all of the concerns of the Problem Solving Team, the Chairman of the Problem Solving Team (the author) created a mock-up of the final form and disucssed it with the District's legal advisor, who determined that it was within the confines of the California Administrative Code, Title 5, the California Education Code, and District policy. Therefore, constraint number one was met. Following this approval, it was presented to the Superintendent and his cabinet. This group, after a brief discussion, approved the use of the form (see Appendix G) and thereby fulfilled the requirements of criteria number three.

Upon receiving the above-stated approvals, the Problem Solving Team was re-convened and a final review of the form was conducted. Hearing that the form met all of the constraints and criteria as established by the Problem Solving Team, they gave the form their endorsement and thus met the requirements of constraint number two.

Field Test Plans

With the final form approved, as stated above, the Coordinator of Specialized Instruction completed plans for the mock-up to be printed on

three-part carbonless paper. The forms were distributed at the next General Staff meeting where it was discussed. Since this was the last meeting of all District administrators for the school year, it was indicated that the form would be available and was to be used on a field-test basis during the ensuing school year. Because the purpose of this study was to develop a tool to evaluate non-classroom assigned certificated personnel in a meaningful and appropriate manner, the current plans for its field test is as follows:

1. By September 15 - Distribute forms.
   Review process with all site administrators.
2. By September 30 - Review process and discuss procedures with all administrators in a group meeting.
3. By October 30 - Items 1 - 5, Section 2 (See Appendix D) completed.
4. By May 30 - Items 6 and 7, Section 2 (See Appendix D) completed.
5. By June 30 - Items 8 and 9, Section 2 (See Appendix D) completed.

Field Test Plans Review Process

An item to be included on the Agenda of the last General Staff meeting of the 1978-79 school year will be a discussion of the effectiveness of the final form. To determine if the tool is indeed an effective one, one full school year is needed to field test the instrument to ascertain its effectiveness. Its effectiveness will be evaluated by:

1. Informal discussion.
2. Analysis of comments contributed.
3. Analysis of an evaluation sheet to be prepared and distributed to all evaluators involved in the field test plans.

The results of the above will be tabulated and submitted in a subsequent addition to this paper.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to develop a tool to evaluate non-classroom assigned certificated personnel in a meaningful appropriate manner. A Problem Solving Team was selected to include a representative sample of those involved in the evaluation process. Once the goal for the study was agreed upon, the team solicited sample forms from districts of comparable size and composition, as well as from administrators within the District. Twenty-two sources were consulted for suggestions. These, in addition to the actual examples received from the poll of districts as stated above, created a sizable source from which to draw.

From the gathered material a suggested form was created and presented to the Problem Solving Team. The form was revised slightly, basically in semantics, and re-presented to the team. This final form received approval from the team who indicated it met all of the constraints and criteria that had been established. Following approval of the Problem Solving Team, the chairman presented the form to the Superintendent's cabinet where, after a brief discussion, it was approved for printing.

The approved form has been sent to the printer where it was printed on three-part carbonless paper as a District form. When the form is filled in, the final distribution of the copies is one to the evaluator, one to the evaluatee, and one to the evaluatee's personnel file.

A sample copy of the final form was mailed to the six contributing districts who indicated they were desirous of receiving a final copy. An

accompanying letter (Appendix H) was enclosed for their reference.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The Problem Solving Team was extremely pleased with the results of the study and the entire process. Of particular pleasure to the team were:

1. The quality of samples received from surveyed districts.
2. The input contributed by District personnel in evaluating the developed form.

Analysis of the approved form indicates that it meets all of the established constraints and criteria, particularly in that it is:

1. non-ambiguous, simple and germane,
2. geared to input from evaluator and evaluatee,
3. structured to provide continuity over a period of years,
4. manageable, succinct, and easy to administer.

The form, having received approval form the Superintendent and his cabinet, has been sent to the printer and will be ready for implementation and field testing during the 1978-79 school year.

Recommendations

Based upon the results and conclusions of this study, the form will be field-tested and evaluated in the Corona-Norco Unified School District during the 1978-79 school year. The plans for this field testing are outlined on page 24, and are ready for implementation. The results of the field test will be incorporated into an addendum which will follow as that information is known.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
300 BUENA VISTA AVENUE · CORONA, CALIFORNIA 91720 · 714/736-3301

AUGIE RAMIREZ, Ed.D., Superintendent
Telephone 714/736-3251
Paul V. Buckley, Asst. Superintendent
Administrative Services · 736-3366
Austin M. Mason, Ed.D., Asst. Superintendent
Instructional Services · 736-3341
W. Neal Wright, Asst. Superintendent
Personnel Services · 736-3266

BOARD OF EDUCATION
Glen A. Coulter
Pauline G. Fiardo
Willard C. Love
Peg Schumate
Louis VanderMolen

TO: Selected Directors of Personnel

FROM: James Johnson
Coordinator of Specialized Instruction

DATE: August 19, 1977

During the past few years our district has seen an increase in the number of positions filled by certificated personnel which do not have specific students assigned to them on a regular basis.

Of concern to us at this point is the lack of any meaningful tool or procedure to evaluate these people. I am referring to certificated positions such as resource teachers, nurses, counselors, student advisors, supervisors, assistant and vice-principals, etc. We would like to explore the various methods that are currently in use for the evaluation of these people and hopefully develop a meaningful instrument for use in our district. In order to accomplish this goal, I would appreciate it if you would please:

1. send me a copy of the form or procedure that is being used in your district to evaluate those people assigned to you; and
2. jot down, and return with this, a few notes indicating what you feel are the strengths and weaknesses of the procedure you use.

If you would like to receive a copy of our end result, I will be happy to mail it to you if you will so indicate on your response.

Thank you in advance for your help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

James Johnson

JJ:cf

APPENDIX B

CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
300 BUENA VISTA AVENUE · CORONA, CALIFORNIA 91720 · 714/736-3301

AUGIE RAMIREZ, Ed.D., Superintendent
Telephone 714/736-3251
Paul V. Buckley, Asst. Superintendent
Administrative Services · 736-3386
Austin M. Mason, Ed.D., Asst. Superintendent
Instructional Services · 736-3341
W. Neal Wright, Asst. Superintendent
Personnel Services · 736-3256

BOARD OF EDUCATION
Glen A. Coulter
Pauline G. Fiardo
Willard C. Love
Peg Schumate
Louis VanderMolen

TO: Certificated Management Team Members

FROM: Jim Johnson

DATE: August 19, 1977

For the past few years I have been concerned for the lack of a district adopted tool or procedure for the evaluation of certificated non-classroom assigned personnel, other than principals. I am referring to those certificated employees who are not specifically assigned students on a regular basis, i.e., resource teachers, counselors, nurses, student advisors, supervisors, assistant and vice-principals, etc. We are required to evaluate these people, yet the only district form available to us is the teacher Stull Bill form or the administrator evaluation form.

I would like to explore the various methods that are currently in use for the evaluation of these people and hopefully develop a meaningful tool. In order to accomplish this goal, I would appreciate it if you would please:

1. send me a copy of the form or procedure that you use to evaluate those people assigned to you; and
2. jot down, and return with this, a few notes indicating what you feel are the strengths and weaknesses of the procedure you use.

Any help you can give will be greatly appreciated. I will keep you informed of my progress and will constantly be open to your comments.

Thanks!

Jim

JJ:cf

APPENDIX C

CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

EVALUATION OF NON-CLASSROOM ASSIGNED
CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEES
FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 19__-__

NAME _____ JOB TITLE _____
(Evaluatee)
SCHOOL/DEPT _____ SUPERVISOR _____
(Evaluator)
TENURED ___Yes ___No PROBATIONARY 1st 2nd 3rd Year
NUMBER OF YEARS IN PRESENT ASSIGNMENT

This form is designed for the evaluation of certificated employees who are not assigned to a classroom. The use of this form enables these employees to be evaluated in terms of their achievement toward self-defined goals that are reviewed and agreed upon by their superiors. It is designed to maintain and improve the quality of services provided, individually and collectively, by the employees of the district by:

1. Identifying and recognizing "good performance" of job responsibility.
2. Identifying conditions under which individuals serve which handicap the effectiveness of their service so that such conditions may be remedied.
3. Identifying personnel whose competency might be enhanced by specific recommendations and cooperative assistance from the district.
4. Identifying personnel whose services are unsatisfactory to such a degree that action will be required to improve performance, reassign, or dismiss the employee.

STEPS IN EVALUATION:	DATE	Evaluator Initials	Evaluatee Initials
1. Pre-Conference			
2. Mutual agreement of job description established*			
3. Mutual agreement on objectives established.			
4. Mutual agreement on assessment methods established			
5. Mid-year conference scheduled for			
6. Mid-year conference held			
7. Post evaluation conference scheduled for			
8. Post evaluation conference held			
9. Evaluation forms completed			
10. Final evaluation submitted to Evaluatee			
11. Final evaluation submitted to Personnel Office			

*Copy of Job Description to be attached.

OBJECTIVES FROM LAST YEAR'S EVALUATION NOT ACHIEVED

GOALS for this school year:

1.

2.

3.

Code	Objectives	Assessment Techniques	Assigned Priority	Mid-Year Conference: Degree of Achievement	Mid-Year Conference: Assigned Priority	Post-Conference: Degree of Achievement	Post-Conference: Extenuating Circumstances

CODE:

1. Professional Growth
2. Job Skills
3. Consultation and Advisory assistance to others
4. Supervision of personnel and programs
5. Educational Leadership
6. Personal Relations
7. Adjunct duties
8. Others

Specify here any conditions which handicapped effectiveness of evaluatees' service:

Strongest Assets:

Areas in which improvement is needed:

EVALUATEES' RESPONSES

Yes No 1. My Evaluator has met with me at least three times during this year to set realistic and worthwhile objectives, establish responsibility and review progress.

Yes No 2. My Evaluator has provided assistance to me as an aid to attaining my objectives.

Yes No 3. My Evaluator is sensitive to my needs and concerns.

Yes No 4. I plan to submit an addendum describing our relationship in greater detail.

OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS

[] Consistent with professional standard of competence.
[] Generally satisfactory.
[] Improvement is needed in the noted areas.
[] Below standard of competence.
[] Unsatisfactory. Major improvement is needed. Suggestions for these improvements have been made and are attached.

EVALUATEE'S SIGNATURE AND DATE

_____ _____

My signature does not necessarily indicate agreement.

EVALUATOR'S SIGNATURE AND DATE

_____ _____

APPENDIX D

Sections 2, 5, 6 and 7 of final form.

Sections which provide input from evaluator and evaluatee and are manageable, succinct, and easy to administer.

NAME _____ (Evaluatee) JOB TITLE _____

SCHOOL/DEPT _____ SUPERVISOR _____ (Evaluator)

TENURED ___Yes ___No PROBATIONARY 1st 2nd 3rd Year

NUMBER OF YEARS IN PRESENT ASSIGNMENT

STEPS IN EVALUATION:	DATE	Evaluator Initials	Evaluatee Initials
1. Pre-Conference			
2. Mutual agreement of job description established			
3. Mutual agreement on objectives established.			
4. Mutual agreement on assessment methods established			
5. Post evaluation conference scheduled for			
6. Post evaluation conference held			
7. Evaluation forms completed			
8. Final evaluation submitted to Evaluatee			
9. Final evaluation submitted to Personnel Office			

*Copy of Job Description to be attached.

Code	Objectives	Assigned Priority	Assessment Techniques	Degree of Achievement	Extenuating Circumstance

CODE: 1. Professional Growth 3. Consultation and Advisory assistance to others 5. Educational Leadership 7. Adjunct duties
2. Job Skills 4. Supervision of personnel and programs 6. Personal Relations 8. Others

Conditions which may have handicapped the effectiveness of the evaluatees' service.

Salient Points:

Weaknesses/deficiencies:

EVALUATEE'S RESPONSES:

Yes No 1. My Evaluator has met with me periodically to set realistic, worthwhile objectives, establish reasonable responsibility and review progress.

Yes No 2. My Evaluator has provided assistance to me as an aid toward attaining my objectives.

Yes No 3. My Evaluator seems aware of my needs and concerns.

Yes No 4. I plan to submit an addendum describing our relationship in greater detail.

31

APPENDIX E

Sections 3 and 6 of final form.

Sections which provide continuity over a period of years.

SYNOPSIS OF LAST YEAR'S EVALUATION

Salient Points:

Weaknesses/deficiencies:

Conditions which may have handicapped the effectiveness of the evaluatees' service.

Salient Points:

Weaknesses/deficiencies:

APPENDIX F

CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

EVALUATION OF NON-CLASSROOM ASSIGNED CERTIFICATED EMPLOYEE
FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR 19__-__

NAME _____ (Evaluatee) JOB TITLE _____

SCHOOL/DEPT _____ SUPERVISOR _____ (Evaluator)

TENURED ___Yes ___No PROBATIONARY 1st 2nd 3rd Year

NUMBER OF YEARS IN PRESENT ASSIGNMENT _____

This form is designed for the evaluation of certificated employees who are not assigned to a classroom. The use of this form enables these employees to be evaluated in terms of their achievement toward self-defined goals that are reviewed and agreed upon by their superiors. It is designed to maintain and improve the quality of services provided, individually and collectively, by the employees of the district by:

1. Identifying and recognizing "good performance" of job responsibility.
2. Identifying conditions which handicap the effectiveness of their service so that such conditions may be remedied.
3. Identifying personnel whose competency might be enhanced by specific recommendations and cooperative assistance from the district.
4. Identifying personnel whose services are unsatisfactory to such a degree that action will be required to improve performance, or reassignment, or dismissal of the employee may be necessary.

STEPS IN EVALUATION:	DATE	Evaluator Initials	Evaluatee Initials
1. Pre-Conference			
2. Mutual agreement of job description established			
3. Mutual agreement on objectives established.			
4. Mutual agreement on assessment methods established			
5. Post evaluation conference scheduled for			
6. Post evaluation conference held			
7. Evaluation forms completed			
8. Final evaluation submitted to Evaluatee			
9. Final evaluation submitted to Personnel Office			

*Copy of Job Description to be attached.

SYNOPSIS OF LAST YEAR'S EVALUATION

Salient Points:

Weaknesses/deficiencies:

GOALS for this school year:

Code	Objectives	Assigned Priority	Assessment Techniques	Degree of Achievement	Extenuating Circumstances

CODE: 1. Professional Growth 2. Job Skills 3. Consultation and Advisory assistance to others 4. Supervision of personnel and programs 5. Educational Leadership 6. Personal Relations 7. Adjunct duties 8. Others

Conditions which may have handicapped the effectiveness of the evaluatees' service.

Salient Points:

Weaknesses/deficiencies:

EVALUATEE'S RESPONSES:

Yes No 1. My Evaluator has met with me periodically to set realistic, worthwhile objectives, establish reasonable responsibility and review progress.

Yes No 2. My Evaluator has provided assistance to me as an aid toward attaining my objectives.

Yes No 3. My Evaluator seems aware of my needs and concerns.

Yes No 4. I plan to submit an addendum describing our relationship in greater detail.

OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS

1. [] Consistent with professional standard of competence
2. [] Generally satisfactory.
3. [] Below standard of competence.
4. [] Unsatisfactory. Major improvement is needed. Suggestions for these improvements have been made and are attached.

_____ _____
EVALUATEE'S SIGNATURE DATE
My signature does not necessarily indicate agreement

_____ _____
EVALUATOR'S SIGNATURE DATE

41

APPENDIX G

CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
300 BUENA VISTA AVENUE · CORONA, CALIFORNIA 91720 · 714/736-3301

AUGIE RAMIREZ, Ed.D., Superintendent
Telephone 714/736-3251
Paul V. Buckley, Asst. Superintendent
Administrative Services · 736-3386
Austin M. Mason, Ed.D., Asst. Superintendent
Instructional Services · 736-3341
W. Neal Wright, Asst. Superintendent
Personnel Services · 736-3286

BOARD OF EDUCATION
Glen A. Coulter
Pauline G. Fiardo
Willard C. Love
Peg Schumate
Louis VanderMolen

June 13, 1978

TO: Jim

FROM: Augie

RE: Evaluation Form

I am pleased to inform you that your proposed evaluation form has been discussed by the members of my cabinet. They are of the opinion that it is an effective and valuable tool in a format that flows easily and apparently can be completed with a minimum input of time.

We wish to thank you for your efforts in its development and look forward to its use next school year.

APPENDIX H

CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
300 BUENA VISTA AVENUE · CORONA, CALIFORNIA 91720 · 714/736-3301

AUGIE RAMIREZ, Ed.D., Superintendent
Telephone 714/736-3251
Paul V. Buckley, Asst. Superintendent
Administrative Services · 736-3386
Austin M. Mason, Ed.D., Asst. Superintendent
Instructional Services · 736-3341
W. Neal Wright, Asst. Superintendent
Personnel Services · 736-3286

BOARD OF EDUCATION
Glen A. Coulter
Pauline G. Fiardo
Willard C. Love
Peg Schumale
Louis VanderMolen

June 14, 1978

Dear Fellow Educator:

I recently wrote to you, indicating that I was initiating a study to develop a tool to evaluate non-classroom assigned certificated personnel. You were most helpful in sending me sample forms and also asked that I send you a copy of the result of my efforts.

Enclosed is a mock-up of the proposed form. It still needs to receive final approval and is then scheduled to be printed on three-part non-carbon paper. A copy of the completed form will then be given to the evaluator, the evaluatee, and the third copy will be placed in the evaluatee's personnel folder.

I hope you will be able to gleen a bit of useful material from this form and I thank you again for your assistance.

Sincerely,

James Johnson

James Johnson
Coordinator, Specialized Instruction

JJ:cf
Enc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arizona Educational Information System. "Administrator Evaluation, Prepared for Arizona Educators." Bureau of Educational Research and Services, College of Education, Arizona State University. Tempe, Arizona, 86281 February, 1975.

Ohio Association of Elementary School Principals. "Evaluation of Administrators: Guidelines and Procedures." Westerville, Ohio. 1971. 35 pp.

Oldham, Neild. "Evaluating Teachers for Professional Growth. Current Trends in School Policies & Programs. An Education U.S.A. Special Report." National School Public Relations Association. Arlington, VA. 1974 64 pages.

Penn-Harris-Madison School Corp. "Performance-Based Teacher Appraisal Program for the Penn-Harris-Madison School Corporation." Mishawaka, Ind. July 1973. 62 pp.

Saif, Philip S. "A Handbook for the Evaluation of Classroom Teachers and School Principals." Institution: Capitol Region Education Council. Bloomfield, Conn. Sponsoring Agency: Connecticut State Dept. of Education, Hartford. Sept. 1976. 180 pp.

Schmidt, W. "Organizational Frontiers and Human Values." Wadsworth Publishing Co. 1970. p.4.

Tuttle, Lester E., Jr. and Ciccone, Russell A. "A Guide to Staff Development Activities, Using a Florida Conference as a Model." Florida Atlanta University. Boca Raton. Spons. Agency: Office of Education (HEW). Washington, D. C. June 1969. 118 pp.